



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,495	05/18/2001	William Henry Tan	109546	5040
25944	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				WEISBERGER, RICHARD C
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3624		

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/859,495	TAN, WILLIAM HENRY
Examiner	Art Unit	
Richard C Weisberger	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. . . .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: . . .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, optimized profit is not defined, nor is the relationship between it and consumption data and market value information. In claim 7, optimized supply conditions are not defined, nor is the relationship between these decisions and consumption data and market data. In claim 13, optimized demand conditions are not defined nor is the relationship between it and the consumption data and the market value information. In claim 19 , optimized supply conditions are not defined nor is the relationship between it and the consumption data and the market value information. In claim 2,8,14 and 20, optimized decisions are not defined nor is the relationship between the decisions and linear programming.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franses, Time series models for business and economic forecasting in view of Chong et al., An introduction to Optimization.

3. An analysis of the claims follows:

(a) consumption data relating to consumption of the commodity by users is measured; (See, Franses introduction and over view)

(b) the measured consumption data is stored in a computer database:

(c) forecasts for requirements of the commodity are determined using computers; (See, Franses introduction and over view)

(d) the forecasts are transmitted to the computer database via a computer network; (See, Franses introduction and over view)

information relating to the market value of the commodity is transmitted to the computer database via the computer network; (See, Franses introduction and over view). While the reference fails to teach of the so called optimized profit for the commodity which is being traded calculated based on the consumption data and the market value information, the examiner takes official notice that it is will known to apply the prior art forecasting methodologies to forecast future prices and to make trades based upon these prices. Moreover, the trades are conducted to optimize profit. It would be obvious for one apply the forecasting techniques of the prior art to the so called optimizing step as motivated by the need for a trader to capitalize on information not readily available to the public.

Chong, teaches that it is well known to apply linear programming to decisions of economics. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the two teachings as motivated to make the "best" trade.

The examiner takes official notice as the methods of collecting data. These collection methods include automated systems involving meters and sensors. It would be obvious to combine this teaching as motivated by the need to increase accuracy of the forecast.

The examiner takes official notice that electricity consumption, tangible products and services are routinely forecasted by the methods of the prior art.

As for claim 23, the individual user can read on the forecaster whom has the option of modifying the input consumption data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard C Weisberger whose telephone number is 703 308 4408.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vince Millin can be reached on 703 308 1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Richard C. Weisberger
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3624